

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

David Antonio Little, Jr.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Director Bryan P. Stirling, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 0:23-cv-1245-RMG

ORDER

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed what the Magistrate Judge determined was a motion for preliminary injunction. (Dkt. No. 7). Defendants filed a response in opposition. (Dkt. No. 51). The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge for pretrial handling. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) recommending that the motion for preliminary injunction be denied as moot. (Dkt. No. 99). The Magistrate Judge gave notice to the parties that they had the right to file objections to the R & R within 14 days of service of the R & R and a failure to file timely written responses would result in limited clear error review and a waiver of the right to appeal the decision of the district court. (*Id.* at 4). No party filed any timely objections.

The Court has reviewed the R & R and the full record in this matter and determined that the Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that the Plaintiff was not entitled to the issuance of a preliminary injunction. Consequently, the Court adopts the R & R of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt No. 99) as the order of the Court. The motion for a preliminary injunction (Dkt. No. 7) is denied.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Richard Mark Gergel
Richard Mark Gergel
United States District Judge

December 28, 2023
Charleston, South Carolina